



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/925,512	08/10/2001	Hideto Ohnuma	12732-068001	4989

26171 7590 10/05/2004

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
1425 K STREET, N.W.  
11TH FLOOR  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500

EXAMINER
----------

BOOTH, RICHARD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2812

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/925,512	OHNUMA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Richard A. Booth	2812	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,11,14,18,21,32,33,35,36,52,53,55,58,65-78 and 86-99 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,11,18,21,32-33, 35-36, 52-53, 55, 58, 65-72, 74-78, 86-93, and 95-99 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 14,73 and 94 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 11, 18, 32, 35, 52, 55, 61, 65-71, and 86-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki, EP 1 003 223 A2 in view of Karr et al., U.S. Patent 6,534,425 B1.

Yamazaki shows the invention substantially as claimed including forming a conductive film 108 over a semiconductor 102 with an insulating film 103 therebetween; forming a resist pattern 109 on the conductive film; forming a gate electrode 108 by a first etching using the resist pattern wherein a thickness of an edge portion of the gate

Art Unit: 2812

electrode is smaller than a thickness of a middle portion of the gate electrode; and introducing an impurity element into the semiconductor with the gate electrode as a mask to form a first impurity region and a second impurity region in the semiconductor 102, wherein the first impurity region is not overlapped with the gate electrode and the second impurity region is overlapped with the edge portion of the gate electrode (see figs. 1A-4D and paragraphs 0031-0073).

Yamazaki fails to expressly disclose wherein a thickness of an edge portion of the resist pattern is smaller than a thickness of a middle portion of the resist pattern and where the etching to form the tapered gate electrode is performed by dry etching.

Karr et al. discloses a reticle with a diffraction grating in order to form a tapered photoresist which can be transferred to an underlying structure through dry etching (see abstract, figs. 3a-5b and col. 3-line 23 to col. 4-line 42). In view of this disclosure, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of Yamazaki so as to use the reticle pattern and etching process of Karr et al. because this is a suitable method in which to make a tapered gate electrode structure.

Claims 4, 21, 33, 36, 53, 58, 72, 74-78, 93, and 95-99 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki, EP 1 003 223 A2 in view of Karr et al., U.S. Patent 6,534,425 B1 as applied to claims 1, 7, 11, 18, 32, 35, 52, 54-55, 61, 65-71, and 79-85 above, and further in view of Tabata et al., U.S. Patent 5,744,381.

Art Unit: 2812

Yamazaki and Karr et al. are applied as above but fail to expressly disclose forming a reticle or a photoresist mask having a translucent film portion.

Tabata et al. discloses the use of a translucent mask such as silicon nitride for conventional chrome masks in photoresist applications (see col. 1-lines 58-64). In view of this disclosure, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of Yamazaki modified by Karr et al. so as to use the translucent mask of Tabata et al. because such a mask will improve the resolution characteristic of the exposure apparatus.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 7/1/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Karr fails to show wherein a diffraction grating pattern is formed so as to be perpendicular to the photomask or the recticle. However, note from fig. 3A of Karr, for example, that the diffraction grating pattern is perpendicular to the lateral dimension of the photomask.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 14, 73, and 94 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected claim, but would be allowable if written in independent form to include all the limitations of the present independent claim.

Art Unit: 2812

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard A. Booth whose telephone number is (571) 272-1668. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Niebling can be reached on (571) 272-1679. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2812

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Richard A. Booth', is positioned above the printed name.

Richard A. Booth  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2812